

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.nsyolo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/964,807	09/28/2001	Stephan J. Jourdan	2207/12004	2860	
23838 KENYON & F	7590 02/06/200 KENYON LLP	EXAMINER			
1500 K STRE	ET N.W.	COLEMAN, ERIC			
SUITE 700 WASHINGTO	N. DC 20005		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2183		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/06/2009	PAPER	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)						
09/964,807	JOURDAN, STEPHAN J.						
Examiner	Art Unit	Ī					
Eric Coleman	2183						

	Elic Colelliali	2103	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 27 January 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance, (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date     The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Anno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth	in the final rejection, which	chever is later. In
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of chortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>		. ,	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b  (a) They raise new issues that would require further or  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belot  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. If or purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fail e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13.  Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
	/Eric Coleman/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2183	

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons stated in the final rejection. The arguments were not persuasive. Therefore the rejections in the final office action are maintained. The Examination contends that the prior art cited and discussed in the Final rejection taught the claimed limitations. The limitation of determining whether data for the older store microinstruction is available is taught in col. 5, lines 14-67 of Feiste As to the STA and STD limitations these are abbreviations of microinstructions for the store microoperation which is taught by the cited prior art to the extent claimed, and which the claimed limitations are discussed in the outstanding final rejection. Note the operation of computing the address and storing the data are provided by the store incroinstructions of the cited prior art. The determining dependency of the STA or STD and the comparing of the address are taught by Keller and Feiste as discussed in the outstanding rejection. . Fieste also taught comparing an identifier of the store instruction (including determining if the store is forwardable and also comparing a CTAG) (e.g., sec ol. 5, lines 14-67). Since the STA and STD are operations part of the store instruction then clearly making the determinations and/or deferring scheduling for the corresponding STA and STD protions. Therefore the claimed operations performed using the STA or STD microinstructions are taught by the cited prior art. As to the alteration of the rejection in the final rejection this is proper since support for the rejection remains the same See 190 USPO at 425.